DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 345 677 HE 025 590

AUTHOR Edwards, Donald M.
TITLE Overcoming Institutional Impediments to Rewarding Teaching.
INSTITUTION Nebraska Univ., Lincoln.
SPONS AGENCY Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Apr 92
NOTE 19p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, April 24, 1992)
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Instruction; *Faculty Promotion; Higher Education; *Merit Pay; Policy Formation; Research Universities; Resistance to Change; Rewards; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Effectiveness; *Tenure; Tenured Faculty
IDENTIFIERS *University of Nebraska Lincoln

ABSTRACT

The University of Nebraska-Lincoln (UNL) has undertaken a long-term project to insure that effective teaching is rewarded and, in particular, has examined the institutional impediments to rewarding teaching as well as research. To this end a survey was conducted of 449 faculty who participated in early phases of the rewarding teaching project. In addition interviews were conducted with college deans and campus administrators. Results of the surveys indicated a widespread feeling among faculty that teaching is not taken as seriously as research. Results also indicated several barriers to rewarding teaching: (1) professional and disciplinary pressure to do research; (2) strong institutional research values; (3) the view that teaching is not scholarly; (4) the perception among faculty that they are excellent teachers; (5) high teaching loads but evaluation based on research; (6) faculty perceptions that teaching is not rewarded; (7) faculty resistance to change; (8) and funding requirements of research. In response to the findings, a plan was developed to overcome these impediments which included updating position descriptions, modification of evaluation and reward procedures, annual meetings of different institutional groups, teaching evaluation as part of hiring, establishment of a teaching award, increased funding for teaching, and administrative promotion of teaching. Included are four tables and two survey instruments. (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED345677

Overcoming Institutional Impediments to Rewarding Teaching

Donald M. Edwards
Dean
College of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources
University of Nebraska-Lincoln

April 1992

INTRODUCTION

The University of Nebraska-Lincoln(UNL) has been conducting a study to seek ways to change the reward system for recognizing effective teaching at a major research university. The three-year study has been funded by the US Department of Education Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education(FIPSE). During the first year, two departments from each of two colleges participated in the study. The study, under the direction of Dr. Leverne Barrett, Professor, Department of Agricultural Education, and Dr. Robert Narveson, Professor, Department of English, involved the College of Arts and Sciences (a liberal arts college) and the College of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources (a professional college). From the original four departments, the study during the third year involved twenty-seven departments in five colleges. The three new colleges were the College of Engineering and Technology, College of Dentistry, and Teachers College.

The reader is referred to a set of four papers presented at the 1992 AERA Annual Meeting in San Francisco, April 24, 1992. The four complementing papers were presented in a symposium titled, Achieving Parity in Reward Structures for Teaching at Research Institutions. The four papers are: Implementing an Institutional Change Model for Rewarding Teaching at Research Oriented Universities by Leverne Barrett, Overcoming Institutional Impediments to Rewarding Teaching by Donald Edwards, Diversity of American Academic Cultural and Its Impact on Reward Structures by Robert Narveson, and Balancing the Reward Structures of Promotion, Tenure, and Merit by John Peters. All authors are from the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. This paper does not include a list of references. References are presented in Barrett's and Narveson's papers.

OBJECTIVE

To overcome institutional impediments to rewarding effective teaching at a major research university.

SURVEYS OF OPINIONS:PRE-FIPSE PROJECT

Twenty-seven departments in five colleges for a total of 449 faculty have participated in the project. The faculty in these departments represented varying backgrounds. Table 1 presents the major program emphasis in each department. Each faculty member should have specific responsibilities as shown on a Position Description. All of the departments have program emphasis in teaching; most in research and several in extension(outreach) and service/clinical. Only faculty with teaching and research responsibilities participated in the study.

A Rewarding Teaching Project Questionnaire was developed by L. Barrett and R.Narveson with consultation from numerous experts in questionnaire design. The questionnaire is shown in Table 2. The questionnaire was completed by the participating faculty and analyzed as determined by the project design. The results of the questionnaires are shown in Tables 3 and 4. The numerical values are on a scale of 1-5, with the lower the number the higher the agreement. Interviews were conducted of college deans and campus administrators.

AERA 25-590

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Donald M. Edwards

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

BARRIERS TO REWARDING TEACHING

The University of Nebraska-Lincoln, an AAU Land Grant Institution, considers teaching and research important. Ask most administrators at this university, as well as at similar universities, and they will quickly state the importance of teaching. Through interviews with college deans and campus administrators at UNL, this support was clearly stated by all administrators. Further, each stated that teaching was equally rewarded with research. When asking the same administrators and their faculties whether the faculty support these same views to what the university values in practice, uncertainty emerged.

Surveys given to faculty before any FIPSE intervention strategies demonstrated the widespread feeling among faculty that teaching is not taken as seriously as research. Results from these surveys provided several barriers to rewarding teaching. These barriers, among others, are as follows:

* A strong influence of the professions and disciplines exist on the faculty member to do research. A loyalty exists by the faculty to support the peer pressures of the professions and disciplines rather than the university and the academic department. There is a perceived general lack of support and leadership within a department.
* Strong institutional research values dominate rather than strong teaching values. Institutions rank themselves according to the national and international research reputation of their faculties, rather than on their reputations as teaching institutions.
* Teaching is not considered scholarly. Scholarly activity is considered measured only by research publications, grants and contracts and does not include publication of textbooks, classroom performance and advising undergraduate and graduate students.
* Faculty members perceive that they are excellent teachers. There is a distrust of results from student evaluations and peer evaluation. The classroom is sacred to many teachers. There is the perception that teaching is not measurable.
* Faculty are assigned high teaching loads but they are evaluated and rewarded on their research accomplishments. Rewards of merit go to research outputs and not to teaching accomplishments.
* Perception of faculty that teaching is not adequately rewarded. There is a distrust of administrative expressions of high regard for teaching and appropriate rewards.
* There is faculty resistance to change. Despite expressed concerns for perceived rewards, there continues resistance to change.
* Research is perceived as receiving disproportional larger amounts of funding than teaching for equipment, maintenance of facilities, graduate student support, and professional development.

These impediments have been transferred into a pressure point/action plan strategy, Table 5.

From pre-FIPSE project surveys of faculty from participating departments, several observations can be seen. On a question asking about personal interests, 65% of the faculty members identified themselves as more interested in research than in teaching (in the College of Arts and Sciences this was 82%), and 88% agreed or strongly agreed that research should be important for tenure. In describing department priorities for promotion and tenure (which reflect faculty attitudes), 92% said research is a major factor for tenure while only 36% identified teaching. Similarly only 20% agreed or strongly agreed that their department's tenure policies encourage interest in teaching, while 71% agreed or strongly agreed that publishing is more important than teaching in their department.

The origins of this perspective on priorities are not easy to specify , but there are some clues. Only 39% of faculty stated that merit increases are often or very often a result of performance in teaching, and only 26% have often or very often received adequate feedback on their teaching performance. In fact, 49% said their department chair has discussed their teaching with them either not at all or only to a small extent. There has also been selective hiring of faculty who have greater research interests, as only 23% agree or strongly agree that departments considered teaching as important as research in recruiting new faculty. Faculty placed some responsibility for these attitudes

on administrators, as only 41% agreed or strongly agreed that administrators encouraged teaching experimentation and 54% agreed or strongly agreed that a favorable climate for improvement existed in their college. There is 65% agreement that a favorable climate existed in the departments, though this seemed at odds with other descriptions of department priorities and actions.

One result of these attitudes was that relatively little energy has been devoted to development of teaching skills per se, as opposed to upgrading the content of courses. Whereas 94% stated that they updated the content of their courses often or very often, only 28% reported that they have often or very often read about or attended a seminar on improvement of teaching. Even talking with colleagues about teaching methods was reported often or very often by only 36% of faculty. Faculty reported less interest in teaching than in research, and there appeared to be relatively little energy put into developing and improving teaching. The percentage of faculty actively involved in development of teaching was discouragingly low, especially given that one might expect over reporting of these activities to a teaching project.

The data suggested that faculty in general believe that research is more important than teaching, and any change in the status quo will only result from active leadership rather than natural drift of attitudes. This project was intended to offer leadership that will emphasize teaching on a par with research and promote activities that will develop new teaching projects. To maximize the output of a scholar teacher, it is important to have a proper balance of teaching and research or other scholarly activity. A second survey of faculty attitudes will be taken at the completion of the project. Expectations are that there will be some change in faculty perception of the importance of teaching among faculty and administrators.

PLAN FOR OVERCOMING IMPEDIMENTS, INCLUDING SOME OUTCOMES TO DATE

Each participating department has developed a plan for improving teaching effectiveness in its department. Based on these outcomes, a master document has been developed. The document, Pressure Points for the Reward of Teaching Identified by Faculty, is shown in Table 5. Action plans have been developed for each pressure point.

The following outcomes resulting from partnerships among faculty members and administrators are a few examples of changes to overcome impediments resulting from this project (These outcomes are cross-referenced with the action plans shown in Table 5):

1. Position Descriptions for each faculty member are being updated. Reward will be more closely linked with faculty member expectation.(8.A.;9.A.)
2. Modification of promotion, tenure, and annual evaluation procedures are being reviewed to assure appropriate credit is provided.(6.B.;8.B.,C.;13.A.,B.,C.)
3. Annual meetings are held with administrators, department heads/chairs, and representatives from promotion and tenure committees to review procedures and agree upon expectations of the reward system.(7.B.;9.B.,C.)
4. Encourage "teaching-in-a-classroom" session for all candidates interviewing for a position that will involve teaching.(10.A.)
5. The University of Nebraska has made available for the first time an outstanding teacher award to complement a similar research award.(1.E.;6.E.,F.)
6. The University of Nebraska Foundation has made for the first time part of their annual competitive funds available specially for teaching and student programs.(1.D.;6.A.)
7. The University Board of Regents has made student educational programs, facilities, and equipment the top priority for funding in the 1993-1995 state funding request.(2.A.,B.)
8. The campus administrators are promoting student and teaching programs as they address the general public.(5.D.,G.)
9. New awards at college levels have been established, namely an Instructional Improvement Award.(1.F.;6.C.)
10. The University of Nebraska Foundation has initiated a new campaign to

raise funds to focus on improvement of educational and teaching programs.(1.E.)

11. Endowments and other support are being requested for Teaching Chairs.(1.E.)
12. Faculty members are being requested to develop "teaching portfolios" to document teaching.(9.A.,D.;10.A.)
13. Discretionary salary money has been used to upgrade salaries of exceptional teachers.(1.H.;12.A.,B.)
14. Promotions to full professor have been made when the faculty member has an outstanding teaching record and an adequate research record.(11.A.)
15. Open round-table discussions with faculty from several departments have resulted in shared experiences of promoting teaching.(14.C.)
16. College Action plans reflect the importance of teaching.(5.D.)
17. The term " Scholar Teacher" is an outgrowth of this project, resulting in an increased level of importance to teaching.(9.F.)
18. Faculty who will hold teaching appointments will be expected to have had previous teaching experience. Faculty members who have demonstrated stronger teaching than research accomplishments are being hired. (10.A.)
19. Courses in teaching improvement are being promoted for graduate students who plan a career that may involve teaching.(3.C.)
20. A Teaching Journal Series has been established for teaching publications.(14.A.)
21. New evaluation instruments have been developed by some departments to assess teaching performance.(7.A.;8.C.)
22. News releases are made of outstanding teaching performance and human interest events.(14.A.,B.,C.,D.,E.)
23. Professional development programs are available to all faculty. The faculty are strongly encouraged to participate in these programs.(1.G.;4.A.)
24. Special funds have been made available for improving learning environments, including classrooms.(2.A.,B.)

FINAL OUTCOMES PER POST-FIPSE PROJECT

Surveys will be made with the participating faculty and administrators in the FIPSE project. The outcomes will be assessed and shared with University of Nebraska faculty and administrators and with similar people at other universities who share similar concerns. From initial correspondence with other universities, there is considerable interest in this topic. The surveys will document if faculty view the steps taken to overcome impediments as positive toward improving the reward system for effective teaching at a major research university.

Table 1. Program Emphasis of Departments Participating in the FIPSE Project.

Department	College	Program Emphasis			
		Teaching	Research	Extension	Service
Agricultural Communications	CASNR	x			x
Agricultural Economics	CASNR	x	x	x	
Agricultural Education	CASNR	x	x	x	
Agronomy	CASNR	x	x	x	x
Animal Sciences	CASNR	x	x	x	
Anthropology	CAS	x	x		x
Art	CAS	x	x		
Biological Sciences	CAS	x	x		
Biological Systems Engineering	CASNR/CET	x	x	x	
Biometry	CASNR	x	x		x
Dentistry	CD	x			x
English	CAS	x	x		x
Food Science	CASNR	x	x	x	
Forestry, Fisheries, and Wildlife	CASNR	x	x	x	
Geography	CAS	x	x		
Geology	CAS	x	x		
History	CAS	x	x		
Horticulture	CASNR	x	x	x	
Industrial Engineering	CET	x	x		x
Mathematics and Statistics	CAS	x	x		x
Music	CAS	x	x		
Plant Pathology	CASNR	x	x	x	
Political Science	CAS	x	x		
Psychology	CAS	x	x		x
Sociology	CAS	x	x		x
Special Education	TC	x	x		x
Veterinary Sciences	CASNR	x	x	x	x

CASNR - College of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources
CAS - College of Arts and Sciences
CD - College of Dentistry
CET - College of Engineering and Technology
TC - Teachers College

Table 2. University of Nebraska-Lincoln Rewarding Teaching FIPSE Project Questionnaire

UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA-LINCOLN
REWARDING TEACHING PROJECT QUESTIONNAIRE

Note: The purpose of this questionnaire is to determine the climate for teaching at UNL. Your responses will provide a basis for developing improvements in the reward structure. Some questions used were adapted from other questionnaires: A. Chickering, et. al. An Inventory of Good Teaching Practices; R. Brown, Research on Faculty Reaction to Annual Review; C. McClain, Promotion, Tenure Survey.

Please put your answers on the mark-sense form with a #2 pencil. **DO NOT** put your name on the answer sheet. Put the last 4 digits of your social security number in **K L M N** in the **special code section**, bottom left of the answer sheet. This is needed for statistical purposes only.

* *

PART I - GENERAL

1. What is your present position?
   A. Administrator other than Chair
   B. Full-time Faculty
   C. Department Chair
   D. Part-time Faculty

2. Are you presently:
   A. Tenured
   B. Non-Tenured, but on tenure track
   C. Not on tenure track

3. What is your present academic rank?
   A. Professor
   B. Associate Professor
   C. Assistant Professor
   D. Instructor

4. At what levels do you hold teaching assignments?
   A. Graduate only
   B. Graduate & Undergraduate
   C. Undergraduate only
   D. None

5. Promotion/Tenure (Personnel or Executive) Committee Member
   A. Yes
   B. No

6. Your College
   A. Business
   B. Home Economics
   C.
   D.
   E.

Approximately, how are each of the following activities distributed within your present assignment? Please indicate your answer for each question on the mark sense sheet provided.

	75-100%	50-74%	25-49%	0-24%
7. Research	A	B	C	D
8. Teaching	A	B	C	D
9. Service	A	B	C	D
10. Administration	A	B	C	D

11. Disregarding institutional or peer influence, my personal interests in teaching and research lie primarily as follows:

    A. Interest very heavy toward research.
    B. Interest in both, but leaning toward research.
    C. Interest in both, but leaning toward teaching.
    D. Interest very heavy toward teaching.

Within your Department, what factors are principally considered in evaluating a faculty member for tenure? Please indicate the importance of each factor on the mark-sense sheet provided.

		Department			
		Major Factor	Minor Factor	Not A Factor	Don't Know
12.	Classroom teaching	A	B	C	D
13.	Research	A	B	C	D
14.	Supervision of graduate study.	A	B	C	D
15.	Publication	A	B	C	D
16.	Student Advising	A	B	C	D
17.	Length of service in rank	A	B	C	D
18.	Competing job offers	A	B	C	D
19.	Personal attributes	A	B	C	D

Please indicate the frequency with which each of the following factors are used to evaluate teaching effectiveness within your Department.

		Department			
	Factor	Frequently Used	Sometimes Used	Not Used	Don't Know
20.	Formal student ratings	A	B	C	D
21.	Informal student opinions	A	B	C	D
22.	Peer evaluation	A	B	C	D
23.	Student final grade distribution	A	B	C	D
24.	Self evaluation report	A	B	C	D
25.	Colleagues' opinions	A	B	C	D
26.	Scholarly research & publication	A	B	C	D
27.	Chairman evaluation	A	B	C	D
28.	Dean evaluation	A	B	C	D
29.	Committee evaluation	A	B	C	D
30.	Course syllabi	A	B	C	D
31.	Course materials and exam	A	B	C	D
32.	Class enrollment	A	B	C	D

* * * *

PART II - TENURE/PROMOTION

Please express your personal judgment/opinion on the following questions regardless of the present policies and practices within your department. Please respond to each of the items listed below using the format shown below.

SA=Strongly Agree A=Agree U=Undecided D=Disagree SD=Strongly Disagree

	SA	A	U	D	SD
33. Research should be an important factor in order to gain tenure.	A	B	C	D	E
34. The tenure objectives at this institution are clear with regard to teaching.	A	B	C	D	E
35. It is more important to publish than teach well in my department.	A	B	C	D	E
36. The present tenure system at UNL encourages interest in teaching.	A	B	C	D	E

* * * *

		SA	A	U	D	SD
46.	I regularly attend events sponsored by student groups.	A	B	C	D	E
47.	I return examinations and papers within a week.	A	B	C	D	E
48.	I give students detailed evaluation of their work early in the term.	A	B	C	D	E
49.	I give my students written comments on their strengths and weaknesses on exams and papers.	A	B	C	D	E
50.	I call or write a note to students who miss several classes.	A	B	C	D	E

* * * *

NOTE: Answer Format Change

PART IV - REWARDS/EVALUATION

In you department, how often are each of the items listed below used?

	Very Often	Often	Occas-ionally	Rarely	Never
59. Explicit criteria are used for evaluating teaching performance.	A	B	C	D	E
60. Faculty members receive release time and other support to develop new ways of teaching.	A	B	C	D	E
61. Faculty members receive adequate feedback concerning their performance as teachers and advisors.	A	B	C	D	E
62. Annual merit increases are directly tied to faculty performance in teaching.	A	B	C	D	E
63. This department recognizes advising as a legitimate part of the faculty's work load.	A	B	C	D	E

NOTE: Answer Format Change

Please respond to each of the items listed below using the format shown below.

SA=Strongly Agree A=Agree U=Undecided D=Disagree SD=Strongly Disagree

	SA	A	U	D	SD
64. The present evaluation system within my department validly measures effective teaching.	A	B	C	D	E
65. The present evaluation system within my college validly measures effective teaching.	A	B	C	D	E
66. Merit raises should reflect performance in teaching.	A	B	C	D	E
67. Student ratings of teaching are a sufficient index of teaching performance.	A	B	C	D	E
68. Sufficient evidence is currently available to fairly evaluate effective teaching for promotion, tenure and merit decisions.	A	B	C	D	E

* *

PART V - INSTITUTIONAL CLIMATE

		SA	A	U	D	SD
69.	High-ranking administrators or department chairperson generally encourage professors to experiment with new courses and teaching methods.	A	B	C	D	E
70.	It is almost impossible to obtain the necessary financial support to try out a new idea for educational practice.	A	B	C	D	E
71.	In my experience it has not been easy for new ideas about educational practice to receive a hearing.	A	B	C	D	E
72.	A favorable climate exists within my department for the improvement of teaching.	A	B	C	D	E
73.	A favorable climate exists within my college for the improvement of teaching.	A	B	C	D	E

Thank you for your time and effort.

Table 3. 1990 Summary of Faculty Opinions Regarding Teaching and Rewards - Eight Departments.

UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA-LINCOLN

1990 SUMMARY OF FACULTY OPINIONS

REGARDING TEACHING AND REWARDS

Selected Questions	Geo. n=10	Pol. Sc. n=12	Music n=33	Math n=30	Bio Sys. Eng. n=13	An. Sc. n=23	Plant Path. n=6	Biometry n=6
. More impt. to pub. than tea.	2.1*	1.8	2.9	2.4	2.7	2.7	1.5	2.5
. UNL tenure sys. encourages tea.	3.8	3.3	3.9	2.4	3.5	3.1	3.7	2.8
. Know students.	3.5	3.8	2.0	3.4	1.8	2.4	2.5	2.2
. New fac. recruited on tea.	3.9	3.1	2.4	3.4	3.5	3.4	4.0	3.5
. Notify student missed class.	3.7	4.7	2.8	4.0	3.1	3.4	2.8	4.0
. Attend seminar/read about tea.	3.7	3.2	3.0	3.3	2.5	2.5	3.2	2.5
. Exchange ideas on tea. meth.	3.0	2.9	2.4	2.2	2.8	2.4	3.0	2.0
. Seek help from TLC.	4.2	4.3	4.3	4.3	3.8	3.8	4.0	4.0
. Grants for tea.	4.2	3.8	4.6	4.3	4.0	4.1	4.5	4.2
. Time D.H. spent w. you on tea. goals.	3.7	4.4	3.8	3.1	3.2	2.9	4.2	3.4
. Time D.H. spent w. you on Res. goals.	3.0	4.3	3.1	2.9	2.8	2.6	2.2	3.0
. Better evid. on tea. change D.H. opinion.	3.8	4.0	3.4	3.9	3.6	3.6	4.8	3.0
. Dept. explicit criteria eval. tea.	3.3	1.8	2.9	1.7	3.6	3.0	4.2	3.5
. Release time to imp. tea.	4.1	2.7	3.1	3.2	3.2	3.1	4.0	3.3
. Fac. receive adeq. feedbk on tea.	3.4	2.5	3.0	2.3	3.2	3.0	3.7	2.7
. Merit tied to tea.	3.1	1.3	2.7	2.0	2.5	2.5	4.2	3.2
. Dept. eval. valid. meas. tea.	3.1	2.5	3.8	2.7	3.3	2.9	3.5	3.0
. Col eval. valid. meas. tea.	3.6	3.2	3.9	3.1	3.3	3.1	3.3	2.8
. St. ratings adeq.	3.7	3.8	4.1	3.8	4.2	3.8	4.0	4.2
. Sufficient evid. for P/T merit dec. tea.	2.9	2.6	3.8	2.9	3.5	3.1	2.7	3.7
. Adm. encourages new courses, tea. methd.	3.2	2.5	3.2	2.5	3.2	2.3	3.0	2.5
. Favorable climate for tea. dept.	2.7	1.8	2.3	1.7	2.6	2.0	2.8	2.0
. Favorable climate for tea. Col.	2.8	2.3	2.9	2.1	2.6	2.0	2.4	2.4

Note: The lower the number, the higher the agreement

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA-LINCOLN
FIPSE REWARDING TEACHING PROJECT
1991 SUMMARY OF FACULTY OPINIONS

SELECTED QUESTIONS:	n=17 AGECON	n=3 AGCOMA**	n=4 AGCOMB**	n=3 ANTHRO	n=12 ART	n=23 BIOSCI	n=14 DENTIST	n=12 FOODSCI	n=6 FOREST	n=9 GEOGR	n=12 HISTORY	n=6 HORT	n=9 INDENG	n=10 SOCIOL	n=19 SPECED	n=16 VETSCI
36. More imp to publish than teach	2.57*	2.75	3.50	2.20	2.61	1.50	3.19	1.92	2.43	1.50	1.81	2.00	2.89	2.00	3.38	1.75
37. UNL tenure sys encourages teach	3.30	4.25	3.00	4.00	3.72	3.61	3.69	3.92	3.57	3.60	2.81	3.70	4.11	3.71	3.19	3.44
40. Professors get to know students	3.43	3.00	3.00	3.40	2.78	3.61	2.06	2.00	1.86	3.80	3.62	2.00	1.89	3.50	2.29	2.81
44. New fac recruited on teaching	3.45	2.25	2.75	3.80	3.50	4.29	3.24	4.00	3.14	3.30	3.50	3.56	3.11	3.80	2.86	3.62
51. Notify students missing class	3.73	3.25	2.75	4.40	3.76	4.29	2.81	3.08	4.29	4.30	3.94	2.89	4.11	4.20	3.05	3.25
52. Attend sem/read about teach	3.22	1.75	2.50	3.20	3.44	3.29	2.76	3.15	3.00	3.80	3.44	2.67	3.44	3.00	2.38	3.06
53. Exchange ideas on teach meth	2.91	2.00	3.00	2.20	2.50	2.86	2.59	3.77	2.86	3.50	3.06	2.78	3.56	2.80	2.48	2.62
54. Seek help from T/L Center	4.17	2.25	3.50	3.80	4.28	4.18	3.35	4.38	4.00	4.10	4.40	4.00	4.67	4.27	2.95	3.56
55. Write grants for teach improve	3.91	3.25	3.75	3.80	4.33	4.21	4.29	4.54	4.00	3.50	4.25	4.44	3.89	4.07	4.33	3.75
57. Time DH spent w/you on tea goals	3.24	2.75	3.00	3.50	3.76	3.57	3.07	3.85	3.17	3.67	4.40	3.33	3.00	4.87	3.05	3.37
58. Time DH spent w/you on res goals	2.48	3.50	3.50	2.50	3.12	3.25	3.53	2.46	2.17	3.22	3.73	2.00	1.89	4.53	2.71	2.50
59. Evidence on teach change DH opin	3.63	4.00	2.50	3.00	4.00	3.69	3.40	3.92	3.50	3.00	4.20	3.78	3.22	4.20	3.57	3.87
60. Dept explicit criteria eval tea	3.06	3.75	2.50	2.50	3.47	2.11	3.73	3.69	3.71	2.20	2.87	3.14	2.89	1.69	3.14	3.75
61. Release time to improve teach	3.05	3.00	1.75	4.75	4.29	3.96	3.80	3.85	3.71	3.80	3.87	3.37	4.00	3.50	3.71	3.75
62. Fac receive adeq feedbk on teach	3.10	4.00	2.25	2.75	3.33	3.11	3.47	3.62	2.86	3.60	3.19	3.87	2.89	3.08	2.71	3.37
63. Merit increases tied to teaching	2.68	3.00	2.00	2.75	3.33	3.19	2.93	3.42	2.71	1.90	2.56	2.75	3.33	1.62	2.71	3.44
65. Dept eval validly measures teach	3.36	4.75	2.50	3.25	3.61	3.96	4.00	3.92	3.14	3.90	3.44	3.33	3.22	3.23	3.52	3.31
66. Col eval validly measures teach	3.50	4.75	2.50	3.25	3.76	3.86	4.13	3.69	4.14	3.80	3.40	3.22	4.00	3.92	3.81	3.00
68. Student ratings are sufficient	4.32	4.25	3.50	3.00	3.83	4.54	3.93	4.15	4.00	4.20	3.94	3.89	3.78	3.29	4.05	3.75
69. Suf evidence avail for P/T/M dec	3.18	3.75	2.75	2.25	3.83	4.04	3.80	4.08	3.86	3.80	3.44	3.12	3.67	2.86	3.75	3.62
70. Adm encourages new courses/methods	2.41	3.75	2.00	2.75	3.06	3.39	3.47	3.23	2.57	3.30	3.37	2.40	3.67	3.54	2.48	2.50
73. Fav climate for teaching in dept	2.27	2.25	2.00	1.80	2.61	2.89	3.07	2.15	2.00	2.50	2.31	2.22	1.89	2.36	1.62	2.62
74. Fav climate for teaching in col	2.23	2.75	2.25	2.50	2.53	2.86	3.33	2.23	2.29	2.80	2.53	2.33	3.11	3.07	1.76	2.25

*NOTE: The lower the number, the higher the agreement.
**Agricultural Communications split into Group A & Group B

Table 4. 1991 Summary of Faculty Opinions Regarding Teaching and Rewards - Sixteen Departments.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 5. Pressure Points for the Reward of Teaching Identified by Faculty.

UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA-LINCOLN
FIPSE PROJECT 1989-92

PRESSURE POINTS FOR THE REWARD OF TEACHING IDENTIFIED BY FACULTY

Pressure Point	Action Plan
Resource Allocation	
1. University resources to improve faculty teaching methods.	A. Increase Instructional Design staff. B. Hire specialists to work with departments. C. Commit more resources to Teaching Council and TLC. D. Make more teaching improvement grant funds available. E. Seek donors for additional teaching related Chairs, Awards. F. Reward exemplary Projects and Activities. G. Provide faculty development leaves for teaching. H. Allocate bonus award to each department to award for outstanding performance in teaching-related activity.
Progress along these lines known to you:	
2. Teaching facilities for modern teaching.	A. More and better equipped classrooms and laboratories for students. B. Instructional equipment/media, charts and maps.
3. Adequate reward for non-tenure lines.	A. Reduce number of teachers on temporary lines. (Increase those on tenure-track.) B. Increase stipends for TAs. C. Increase training and supervision for TAs.
4. College and departmental resources for faculty development in teaching.	A. Work toward regular development leaves for teaching. B. Encourage proposals for leaves related to teaching. C. Make available funds for travel to teaching seminars, workshops, and conferences.

5. Pressure to obtain external funding.	A. Assess guidelines for soliciting and accepting grants. B. Insist that grants be without undesired consequences. C. Decide institutional priorities and actively seek funds directed to high priority activities for teaching. D. Adjust mission statement to reflect quality teaching as an important mission of UNL. E. Administrative leadership to resist pressures from disciplines (e.g. external review committees). F. Resist the "STAR SYSTEM. " G. Promote institutional loyalty. H. Resist undue pressures from faculty for grant-seeking.

Progress along these lines known to you:

_____

_____

_____

_____

Policy

6. Incentives for faculty	A. Promote, solicit and reward proposals to develop plans for teaching improvement. B. Promote and reward faculty collaboration on teaching. C. Establish prizes for reports on classroom research. D. Strengthen mentoring programs--move toward Lilly-style program. E. Re-examine Distinguished Teaching Award or replace campus wide Amoco awards using Foundation funds. F. Reassess standards and guidelines for teaching award nominations.
7. Incentives for departments	A. Establish positive incentives for departments that develop plans and report results. (e.g. Additional merit to departments with plans.) B. Include discussion of reward plans on Chairs and Dean's Council agendas.
8. Process of recommending promotion, tenure, and merit decisions.	A. Identify practices and patterns of adjustments at college level. B. Adjust practices to conform to new statement on promotion and tenure.

C. Revise form for evaluation of teaching (Ag).
D. Change due date for annual reports (Ag).

9. Promotion/tenure/merit guidelines.

A. Ask for reports to Colleges of departmental actions and plans to implement alignment of reward with assignment.
B. Distribute to chairs and personnel committees a list of types of actions that are appropriate and inappropriate.
C. Interpret guidelines (A&S).
D. Encourage teaching portfolios.
E. Assign College Instructional Design Committees the task of ongoing study of promotion/tenure/merit guidelines and suggestions for improvement.
F. Redefine scholarship on a broader basis to include scholarly integration, application, and translation of knowledge.

10. Hiring.

A. Ask candidates to submit teaching portfolios, and demonstrate teaching ability.

Progress along these lines known to you:

_____

_____

_____

_____

Rewards

11. Promotion.

A. Redefine eligibility for full professor with appropriate teaching criterion to allow for exceptional teaching performance.
B. Give appropriate weight to leadership activities in improving collective performance of departmental teaching mission.

12. Merit pay.

A. Examine data on weighting developed in Colleges to see where problem has occurred.
B. Where inequities are identified, Department/ College present plans for revising merit guidelines.

13. Tenure

A. Specify how tenure is achievable on the basis of quality teaching.
B. Define scholarship in teaching.
C. Define acceptable publication record in teaching.

Publicity

14. Balance of image.

A. Include statements about teaching in publicity on research achievements. Sensitize university public relations.
B. Ask University PR to actively pursue articles on teaching at UNL.
C. Assign writers whose mission is to finding and developing features about teaching.
D. Publicize special events (such as Dean's Forums) that spotlight teaching.
E. Develop feature stories on teaching extra-mural teaching activities (such as science fairs and NCH-sponsored discussions and lectures. Send stories to local newspapers.

Progress along these lines known to you:

_____
_____
_____
_____

Pressure Points overlooked in these lists:

_____
_____
_____
_____